

Special Issue

An Introduction to the Book of *Axiomatization of Subjective Dialectics*

Prof. Zhiyong Dong^{1*}¹ Northwest University, P. R. China

* Prof. Zhiyong Dong, Northwest University, P. R. China

Received: October 10, 2019

Accepted: October 22, 2019

Online Published: October 30, 2019

doi:10.22158/wjeh.v2n2p1

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/wjeh.v2n2p1>

This book is dedicated to Prof. BERNARD CULEEN, who was my supervisor and helped me very much when I studied for my PhD. Degree in The Queen's University of Belfast from 1992 to 1998.

Abstract

An brief introduction to contents of the book Axiomatization of Subjective Dialectics by Prof. Zhiyong Dong and the significant to study subjective dialectics at present.

The book *Axiomatization of Subjective Dialectics* is written for those who are interested in philosophy, linguistics, theoretical physics, artificial intelligence, especially in metaphysics, and who have finished their high school studies.

The title of the book was first intended to be *A Preliminary Exploration on the Axiomatization of Some Key Elements of Subjective Dialectics*. However, I changed the title as *Axiomatization of Subjective Dialectics*, for the latter is shorter and may be easier to be remembered by the readers. And the other factors, such as a preliminary exploration and key elements, etc., have to be put into the introduction and the other parts of the book, to resolve the issue that the title should agree with the content.

We could call the contemporary subjective dialectics as dialectical logic according to the contents of the books of *Logic* and *The Science of Logic*, both of which are written by G. W. F. Hegel, who was the latest scholar who epitomized the dialectics. The scope which the contemporary subjective dialectics covers is wider and more abstract than the scope of transcendental logic, which was put forward by Immanuel Kant. Therefore, it's better to choose the concept of dialectical logic as the concept which is antagonistic, corresponding and matching to the concept of formal logic.

Subjective dialectics, or dialectical logic, like formal logic, also studies the phenomena and the ways of human thinking. However, the thinking ways are not totally the same when we make the formal logic

and dialectical logic as opposite, antagonistic and connecting each other at the same time.

The formal logic studies mainly how we can get to know and grasp precisely the objects or phenomena from one perspective or one coordinate system. For instance, the aim for formal logic to study proposition, definition, division, classification, judgment, syllogism, induction, reduction, deduction, the laws of identity, contradiction, and excluded middle, etc., is to get to know and grasp precisely the objects from one perspective or one coordinate system.

The dialectal logic, that is, the subjective dialectics which has been defined by genus and difference, or essence and differentia, or the abstract end and concrete end, studies mainly why and how we can get to know and grasp the objects from multi-perspectives and multi-coordinated system and multi-strata more precisely, and why and how humans should make knowledge absolute, that is, when it is necessary to change the objects as the object of formal logic, in order to get to know the concrete objects more absolute and more accurate, and, etc., and to make the objects, which we study and understand, into the state of affair, which we desire, want, require, demand, claim, more precisely. For instance, the aim for the present volume to discuss and expound the concepts, such as practice, rationality, theory, knowledge, cognition, subject, object, subjectivity, objectivity, being, ontology, quality, quantity, measure, phenomenon, form, essence, matter, content, concept, space, time, relative, absolute, etc., is to explain why humans have to think out and put forward these concepts, and how humans understand and grasp the concrete or substantial objects, which the humans would like to understand and grasp, better and better, and make the human understanding absolute, and make the humans change the objects, which the humans would like to change, according to the human desire, demand and hope, and direct the human practice to raise the absolute level of living standard of human beings. Yuelin Jin, a contemporary Chinese Scholar, says, in his book *Formal Logic*, that “Dialectical logic is a discipline which has been begun to study recently. People have not got the same opinion on the general feature or concrete content of dialectical logic. General speaking, the dialectical logic also take the thinking form and thinking law as its object of research, but there are two viewpoints between formal logic and dialectical logic. The first is that formal logic studies accuracy, clearness, clarification, definition, identity, contradiction and consistency, etc., from the perspectives of thinking way and thing form...while the dialectics logic studies how the thinking way and thing form reflect motion and change of objects correctly, and how the thinking way and thing form reflect the inner contradictions, the organic connections and transformation of objects...Second in formal logic the relations between thinking ways and thinking forms are only true or false. They do not reflect the degree of abstraction or the order of human’s cognition and understanding. The thinking ways and thinking forms have got the parallel feature from the above perspective. On the contrary, the dialectical logic makes the forms of human thinking as an organic system from lower level to higher level, considering the connections and changes of the different forms of human thinking between them in the process of cognition and understanding.” (Note 1)

Or in other words, he did not resolve the problem of the differentia of formal logic or dialectical logic.

Kant's view on the issue does not to the point to resolve the problem of the differentia of formal logic or dialectical logic. (Note 2) However, the viewpoints of the two scholars above are one of the inspirations for me to write this book.

When we make the formal logic and dialectical logic, therefore, unite, reconcile and integrate, we may say that formal logic is a subordinate concept, or a subaltern, or an existent form of dialectical logic. And dialectical logic is the genus, or abstract end, or super ordinate, or generic concept, or essence of formal logic.

The so-called axiomatization of the key elements of subjective dialectics is to define and dispose the above concepts, such as practice, rationality, theory, knowledge, cognition, subject, object, subjectivity, objectivity, being, ontology, quality, quantity, measure, phenomenon, form, essence, matter, content, concept, space, time, relative, absolute, and, etc., by displaying the genus and difference of the above concepts, and display clearly the relations between the above relevant concepts and the other concepts, and make the above concepts as the component part of the dialectic logic, in order to make the readers understand and succeed the concepts in a short time, and develop the philosophy, especially the dialectical logic, faster, more effective and convenient.

The difference between dialectical logic and thinking way of dialectics, including natural dialectics, social dialectics, objective dialectical and subjective dialectics, is that if the thinking way and concepts of dialectics is disposed by the method of pointing out the genus and difference, which is part of formal logic, and if the disposition is agreed by the collegiate of the language community, that is, if the disposition has got the consensus of the language community. Any element of dialectical logic can really become a part of dialectical logic only after it is disposed by pointing out the genus and difference and has got the consensus of the language community, or be understood and used quite often by the relevant persons, and even need to be a part of dictionaries and encyclopedias of the language community.

The method of pointing out the genus and difference of the formal logic is the method of dialectical induction in human thinking during the process of defining the objects, which humans would like to understood and define. For instance, it is the definition of water with a genus and a difference, when we say that water molecule is composed of two hydrogen atoms and one oxygen atom. The definition with a genus and a difference is a higher level in human understanding and cognition. The other way of definition is to illustrate with example in the formal logic. For instance, we usually explain what is water by illustrating river water, well water, rain water, lake water, sea water, etc., when we define water with examples. The way of defining an object by illustrating the examples is less significant very much in the history of the development of science, though it is the foundation for us to define an object with a genus and a difference. The method of dialectical induction is a way for people to induce everything and every kind of things as an existent form of a more simple or more abstract thing or concept, in the course of people's understanding, grasping, and describing the objective world and subjective world, in order to fuse every concrete knowledge with the whole system of knowledge and

cognition of the language community in which the people live, and for people to understand, accept, remember, hand down, pass on and succeed every concrete knowledge, which is useful for the members of the language community to survive and develop. For instance, it has got much more significance and is a leap in the process of cognition when we say that water is a matter which is composed of two hydrogen atoms and one oxygen atom. This cognition and concrete knowledge about water has connected with many cognition and knowledge about the other relative matters and substance and many objective laws which humans have got to know beforehand. It opens a convenient door for humans to exploit and make use of water and the other relevant matters and substances.

This volume would like to take the idea that practice is the first thing and the foundation of human thinking as the guiding idea and would like to use some simple and straightforward words to discuss and expound clearly some concepts and viewpoints, which have been put forward, mentioned, or expounded, or not have been expounded clearly, or even not have been put forward or mentioned in Immanuel Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*, or *Critique of Practical Reason*, or in George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel's *The Encyclopedia Logic (Science of Logic)*, or *Phenomenology of Spirit*, or *Logic*, or in Martin Heidegger's *Being And Time*, or in Jean-Paul Sartre's *Being And Nothing*, in order to make the readers to understand and succeed the concepts and viewpoints, which humans have understood and grasped, and for humans to develop the logical part and methodology faster, quicker and more convenient on the foundation of this volume. The final aim to develop the dialectical logic is to help people to do division of practice, especially the division of labor, better.

That the criterion of a definition with genus and difference is good or not is that if the definition has told its super concept, some of its subaltern or subordinate concepts, some of its appositive concepts, especially its antonymous concept clearly. It correctly use the method of telling a definition with genus and difference, if the definition tells people in this way clearly, for it can increase the quantity of knowledge and help people enlarge their range of thinking and practice.

The aim to tell clearly its super concept is to fuse the concept with the whole system of knowledge which the language community has got as a whole. The aim to tell clearly its appositive concepts, especially its antonymous concept, is to help people to get to know the degree of abstraction of the concept. The aim to tell clearly some of its subordinate concepts is to help people to get to know clearly the connection between the concept and the objective world. Or it can help the readers who are interested in the concept to deduce even to the objects which humans' sense organs, like eyes, ears, noses, tongues, bodies, etc., can perceive, through deducing many times, and make them get to know the concept thoroughly, and make the language community has good foundation to make efficient division and cooperation in their practice, from the perspective of subjectivity.

What should be stated clearly here is that it does not mean that we have made the dialectical logic the same with formal logic, when we dispose the thinking way and concepts of dialectics by the method of pointing out the genus and difference which is part of formal logic, or made the dialectal logic homogeneity with the formal logic. It just like that it does not mean that we have made the relevant

concepts of contemporary taxonomy the same with formal logic, when we say that the genus of botany and zoology is living being, and the differentia of botany is that botany undergo their metabolism by assimilating the sunshine as the sources of the energy, while the zoology undergo their metabolism by eating or assimilating the bodies of the other existence form of zoology and botany.

However, this volume often begins its disposition of many concrete concepts with the method of describing the objects and concepts. It is because that the perspectives of previous description of the relevant objects do not agree with the aim of writing this book, or the previous descriptions are too few to do the definitions with genus and differentia. Furthermore, we can only begin our defining of a concept with the description of the relevant objects and concepts. Only after this process, then we can put forward our definitions with genus and difference of any concept.

In fact, humans always alternate quickly among formal logic, dialectical logic, brief description, complex description, in their thinking, in order to reach the aim of getting to know and expressing the objects and the course of the subjective disposition quickly and precisely from the most ancient times to present day. The humans always choose the thinking way which they think is the best and fastest. The humans would not or could not limit their liberty of thinking absolutely in order to reach the aim of getting to know the objects and the course of the subjective disposition quickly and precisely, because it is an biological instinct which humans have got through the course of the evolution for millions of years.

The so-called liberty of thinking is that the subjects can dispose the same object, or the same concept, or a series of objects, or a series of concepts, from different perspectives, or with many methods, or in different ways, or from different strata, and also can change the objects or concepts which the subjects are disposing at any time, according the subjects' change of interests and needs, in their thinking. In the history of human development, there are only the facts that some of the opinions are forbidden or prohibited to speak out, but never the thinking is forbidden or prohibited from the birthday of humans. So long as the concrete person, who is thinking, does not speak out or take any action, no one knows what he is thinking. Kant says in his *Critique of Pure Reason* that "our thinking subject is not corporeal; in other words, that, inasmuch as it is represented by us as object of inner sense, it cannot, in so far as it thinks, be an object of outer sense, that is, an appearance in space. This is equivalent to saying that thinking beings, as such, can never be found by us among outer appearances, and that their thoughts, consciousness, desire, etc., cannot be outwardly intuited. All these belong to inner sense." (Note 3)

The ancient Chinese proverb that "minds are not corporeal" is a truth. People have not invented such a machine or instrument, which can comprehend a person' thinking exactly, real-time, and all-round. I am afraid that humans can never or ever be able to invent or make such a machine or instrument. Some scholars put forward and persist in the political slogan that each government should give or endue every person the privileges to think freely. Actually they put forward some words which they themselves do not know what the words mean. In reality, everyone makes some time of his living in going off into wild flights of fancy, or let his imagination run away with himself, or in idle, or in

illusion, or in wild guess, being a long or a short time every day. It is a biological instinct to let his imagination run away with himself. This biological instinct humans have got through the course of evolution for millions of years. Hegel said, in his book *The Encyclopedia Logic (Science of Logic)*, the third edition, which was published a year before his passing away, that “subtlety of the empty understanding finds its chief pleasure in the fantastic ingenuity of suggesting possibilities and lots of possibilities.” (Note 4) His appreciation and admiration for the biological instinct of humans is showing clearly between the lines.

The IT company Google of the United States of America had a *go* competition of five matches in March 2016 with its software of Alpha Go against Li Shishi, one of the best *go* players in the world at that time. The result is that Alpha Go won, at the rate of 4:1, in the circumstances that the matches reduced some routines, the most important of which is that no player is allowed to do plundering. Then Google improved Alpha Go software and defeated all the best *go* players, who are still active at present, in the world. Then some persons began to guess that the robots would menace or threaten the existence of humans as a whole in the near future. Some persons even began to study the robot rights. However, I think that they are like the man of Qi, who is a figure in one of the ancient Chinese legend and who was haunted by the fear that the sky might fall, and bark at the moon, because that the computers’ ability of thinking as a whole can not do better than that of humans as a whole forever, never.

There are two reasons for the artificial intelligence as a whole can never do better than human intelligence. The first is that human thinking can be initiative on its own to change its topics and contents of thinking very quickly according to human interests and needs, from love and marriage to going shopping and cooking, from going shopping and cooking to hunting jobs, or to seeing a doctor, etc., or to put the totally irrelevant things together to think and survey their connections, like to put the horses’ jaws with the cows’ heads together, and made the Chinese idiom that horses’ jaws don’t match cows’ heads, and etc. Computer and artificial intelligence can never write a good poem, whose theme is distinct, the language is well-knit in rhyme, flowery, and can make people produce and emerge infinitely and boundless reveries and daydreams, forever, never. It can never make a machine which could do better than Shakespeare in English poem or drama writing, or than Li Bai (A. D. 701-760), the greatest Chinese poet in the Tang Dynasty (A. D. 618-907) in the Chinese history, in Chinese poem writing, even if all the computers in the world, no matter they are big or small, are in the situation of series-parallel, no matter at present or in the future. It is the most difficult issue of artificial intelligence. The second reason is that the human thinking has the dual nature or character, which is individual thinking and the collective thinking at the same time. The dual nature or character is achieved through the division of human thinking. The division of human thinking is connected closely with the collective practice and division of human practice. The human practice is the collective practice and the human thinking is collective thinking since humans emerged. Humans can increase and improve their collective practice and collective thinking on their own initially according to the development of the historical situation. No single robot or group of robots can operate or learn from anything without the

human help. No single robot or group of robots can make a goal, or an aim, themselves.

For instance, the remaining officials and soldiers would choose their battalion commander and adjust the duties of the remaining officials and soldiers on their own initially, according to the duties which the battalion had been entrusted, if the previous commander and many officials and soldiers of the battalion had got sacrificed their lives or serious wounded in the previous battles. Meanwhile the robot soldiers could never, ever do it. Let alone that the making and operating computers and Alpha Go software themselves are the result of the human collective practice and collective thinking.

One of the best go players in the world at present said that only shutting up the electrical power supply or the computer was effected by bugs that the Alpha Go software could be defeated. His real intention was to say that the Alpha Go software was done well and perfect. However, his words shows that it is true to need collective practice and collective thinking, even the collective labor of community as a whole to keep the electrical power supply safe and the Alpha Go software to work well. That is to say, that only human collective practice and collective thinking can keep the robots and artificial intelligence working well, to say nothing that the robots could menace or threaten the existence of, or defeat the humans as a whole, in the future, no matter it is near or far.

Certainly, any individual brain or mind is not as good as a computer in many fields, like the calculation of large data, mechanical memory, the searching of words or pictures, etc. Any individual mind cannot do it better in the above fields, never, ever, than a computer. Otherwise, nobody would produce any computer at all.

The stating way or expressing way is arbitrary in many parts of this book. Its aim is to state simply and succinctly the essence, genus, or abstract end, and the relations between the relevant things and concepts, and the cognition of the relevant things and concepts which we humans have got to know. And more, this method can help the others and following scholars who are interested in the philosophical methodology to grasp and succeed the methods of dialectical logic, which we humans have got to know, and help them to develop the methods of dialectical logic quicker and faster on the above foundation.

The describing way of arbitration in many parts of this book is inspired by the arbitrary stating ways of Euclid's *Geometry*, Newton's *Mathematical Principle of Natural Philosophy*. The historical facts show that the following young scholars can understand and succeed the relevant knowledge, which the humans had got in the past hundreds, even thousands of years, in a short time, since the above books were published. It makes the young scholars be able to develop and innovate new theories on the foundation of the previous scholars faster and more conveniently. It is shown the most clearly in the book of Euclid's *Geometry*. Euclid almost axiomatized all the contents which the present middle school mathematical textbook in his *Geometry*, which was edited by him about 24 centuries ago. He almost always tells the mathematical axioms and the propositions first about each issue in the book. Then he gave the necessary proves and exercises. The learners can grasp and succeed in a short time the most mathematical knowledge which the learners' older generations had got in the past thousands years. It

has made the scholars of younger generations, who were interested in the use and development of mathematics, be at the most front of the research in the mathematical field when they were young. And it has made the scholars of younger generations be able to make the historic development and contributions, when they were young and at the age which could be able to make such contributions.

However, we have to link the philosophical methodology, which we have primarily axiomatized some of its basic elements in this book, with the reality and substance which we face every day, that is, with the experiences of our daily lives, and our daily production and consumption, etc. It is because that almost all the concepts and all the methodology are connected and linked with the reality and substance which humans face every day, and with the experiences of our daily lives, and our daily production and consumption, etc. This is the most important reason why this volume begins its analysis from the concept or notion of practice, which is connected directly with the human objective activities, and stay at the concept or notion of practice, while this volume deals with the ways how humans dispose subjectively the objects in their thinking or minds. In other words, this volume will deal with and define the relevant concepts on the foundation that the human practice is the most fundamental starting point and coordinate. I, like many other scholars, also think that the subjective dialectics can keep its academic vitality and useful to the current time in this way.

I know that there are many characteristics and limitations in my understanding and cognition on the above concepts and notions. Even more, the concepts or notions, which the subjective dialectics and the dialectical logic involve, contain or embody, are much more than I mentioned above. For instance, Hegel expressed clearly that each concept is involved a series of factors and concepts, or a series of thinking moments, in the process of its formation and expressing, when he explained the content of the concept “*concept*”, which some scholars translated as “*pure concept*” or “*absolute concept*”, in the relevant human beings’ mind, in his book *The Science Of Logic*. For instance, he listed the concepts of quality, being, nothing, external existence, being-by-itself, being-in-itself, being-for-itself, determinate, distinction, common point, becoming, limit, quantity, pure quantity, magnitude, discrete magnitude, quantum, essence, measure, appearance, matter, content, form, space, time, absolute, relative, identity, difference, ground, etc., at least nearly one hundred concepts, or thinking moments. (Note 5) But this volume only study a few concepts or thinking moments, or answer only a few questions, such as what is being, what is concept, what is phenomenon, what is essence, what is form, what is matter, what is content, what is quality, what is quantity, what is measure, what is absoluteness, what is relativity, etc. And I believe that I only go or think a little bit better or further on these concepts than the previous scholars. This fact shows that the construction of the system of dialectical logic can’t be completed by a few scholars, or a few generations, or even hundreds of generations of the scholars of the whole world. However, I think that I would be quite satisfied, if some of the contemporary and following scholars would feel that they were more convenient to go further on the foundation of this volume. Then it would be not a waste of my thinking since the year of 1977.

What should be stressed here is that one of the reasons for me to have completed this book is that the

relevant scholars have made much efforts and achievements in the axiomatization of subjective dialectics for thousands of years, especially the relevant Chinese scholars. Their research articles and translations from foreign languages into Chinese language in the past two hundred years have given me much help and many inspirations. In some places, I even directly plagiarized their viewpoints, like in the proposition that subject refers to a human individual or a human community. However, I cannot tell their helps and inspiration one by one in this book, because the expressing style of this book, that is, the style of arbitrary, does not allow me to do this. And my age, vigor, and health do not allow me to do so in another volume, either. It is because that even part of the statements of historical documents and their viewpoints, such as on the concepts of practice, theory, rationality, etc., as displayed in the paragraphs above, just in Chinese language are enough for the contents and topics of hundreds and thousands of doctoral theses. It is not what I can do by myself or by any single person in the world, either. And more, what is plagiarized by me is only the relevant concrete propositions and viewpoints, but not the a long statement word by word. Therefore, I can only express my sincere thanks and deep apologies. Thanks are for their helps and inspirations. Apologies are for me not to tell their helps and inspirations one by one.

Fortunately the old man of history is always just and fair-minded forever. I believe that the following scholars would carding the source and course, origin and development, and would present the just and fair-minded valuation and appreciation to their contributions, so long as the subjective dialectics, or dialectical logic, could develop continuously. And I dared to use the arbitrary style in many places of this book, even copy and plagiarize their propositions and viewpoints, because I keep the belief above. I beg to get the understanding of the relevant scholars again and ask them not to say that I was improper in my research or expressing.

I put forward some new concepts, such as dominant thinking moment and recessive thinking moment, etc., in this book. Some scholars think that the philosophical scholars should not go round and round in the circle of concepts. However, it is better for new ideas or new concepts to be expressed with new nouns and phrases usually, in order to express them briefer and shorter, and help the authors themselves and the other persons to understand and remember. The history of philosophy and science demonstrates that the development of philosophy and science have their hands full with the new concepts. For instance, the sign and indicator of development of modern entomology in recent three hundred years is almost only that entomologists have given scientific names to more than one million species of insects. Therefore, I believe that a new word or a new phrase should be created or formed or thought out to express it, so long as the new word or a new phrase expresses a new thing, or a new idea, or a new philosophical viewpoint, or the same thing, or the same object, which has been disposed for many times, but is disposed from a new aspect, or from a new degree of abstraction, etc. Only the lazy persons, or the persons who have no desire to make progress, refuse to try to understand the new concepts, or new viewpoints, which have been expressed by a new word or a new phrase. Actually the aim and what for philosophy to study is just concepts and words from different aspects or perspectives.

The persons who refuse to try to understand the new concepts or new viewpoints can only be a sticker for ancient ways and things, or an anachronist. They can never contribute to the history of the development of philosophy.

The subjective dialectics and dialectical logic are the most abstract part of philosophy, and the most abstract part of human thinking, and the most abstract branch among all the branches of science and liberal arts. The persons who study them need not only the abundant and rich imagination, but also the extensive and wide-ranging knowledge. Only those who put their all, at least most of the working energies of their whole lives, can make a progress in a project, or a proposition, or a topic, or a concept, on the achievements of the previous scholars.

The practical value for Chinese scholars or the scholars of the other language communities to study the subjective dialectics at present is that China and the other language communities are facing the big change of the unity of written language in the world, because the intercourse of different nations is becoming deeper and deeper in every field, such as in economics, culture, politics, military, etc. Besides, this is also an issue for most of the Chinese families to have to resolve everyday. The glaring and prominent expression of this is that the older generations and leaders of the primary schools and the middle schools have to arrange their younger generations to divide how much time to study English or the other foreign languages everyday. And even those of the older generations, who have to pass the examinations for their professional promotions, have to do so themselves everyday. Accordingly, they also have to resolve the question of arranging the younger generations and themselves to divide how much time to study the knowledge of the other fields which take the mother tongue as the carrier everyday. And every government in the world today has to resolve the issue of choosing which foreign language as the first foreign language for their school pupils to learn.

Written language and political-economical systems are two forms of ideology. They have their independent characters. The expressing form which depend on written language is the most core content of a civilization and also the most important interests of a nation, that is, the most core interests of a nation. The nation would be like subjugated if the national language was forbidden to be used in governments, schools and universities. The previous government officials, school and university teachers would become like illiterate persons and drop from the social elite to the lowest class, like what happened in the northeast part of China from 1931 to 1945, and in Korea from 1895 to 1945. One need not look far for a lesson.

The most core part of Chinese culture is Chinese characters. It is unknown at present that Chinese language with its characters of sense is better, or English language with its alphabet of pronunciation is better. It is a historical course for Chinese language or English language to become the dominant written language in the world at last after all. However, it is definite that only the written language, which can help people to develop the human culture better, will be continued to be used by the younger generations of the humans of the whole world. There is also the phenomenon and law of survival of the fittest in natural selection on the issue of the usage of the written languages.

On the foundation of the writing of this book, I believe on the evidences and facts, that the contemporary Chinese written language with its characters of sense is as good as, and more is even better, than the English written language with its alphabet of pronunciation in the field of abstract thinking, especially in the field of the most abstract field of methodology, that is, the metaphysics. Some of the evidences and facts are that this book resolved the question of what is being, which has been put forward clearly by the philosophers of the ancient Greek 25 hundred years ago, and the question of what is time which has been put forward clearly by the philosophers of the ancient Romans 17 hundred years ago. And this book points out the characteristics on the definitions of the concepts of time, space, relative space, absolute space, relative time, absolute time, etc., in the theories of some of the most famous philosophers and science, such as Martin Heidegger, Albert Einstein, G. W. F. Hegel, Issac Newton, Immanuel Kant, Stephen Hawking, etc. Their characteristics come from the characteristics of the grammars of Latin languages. It is like the difference between the two-dimensional code and bar code. The two-dimensional code has got much more stronger expressing abilities than that of the bar code. It is one of the most important reason why the two-dimensional code is developing very fast in the field of application nowadays. In today's China, even some beggars use the two-dimensional code in their activities of begging. The contemporary Chinese language is just like the two-dimensional code, while the Latin languages are just like the bar code. We can use less characters to express the same meaning if we use Chinese language. For instance, my first book *Absolute Value and the Concept of Human Rights* (Note 6) uses 250,000 Chinese characters. Its English version uses 833,000 characters. Obviously, the Chinese characters used are much less than that of English.

However, the contemporary Chinese language with its characters of sense is only the expressing form. The real advantage of the current Chinese language is that the whole grammar of the current Chinese language is more simple, more open, more flexible than that of English. A noun of Latin system is quite easy to get consensus in Chinese language community. It is quite easy for the words or even their abbreviation of the existent forms of Latin, such as sine, cosine, tangent, cotangent, sin, cos, tan, cot, PM2.5, etc., to get consensus in Chinese language community and become a flawless part of Chinese language. While it is very difficult for those who only know the existent forms of Latin to put any Chinese noun into their language and get the consensus in the language community. It is because that the use of each noun in the existent forms of Latin involves the issues, such as single or plural, countable noun or uncountable noun, feminine or masculine gender, subject or object, etc.

I believe that the easier the grammar of a language is, the easier to be accepted by the people of the communities of the other languages. I myself studied formally three foreign languages, that is, English, Russian and German, to abide by the stipulations of the universities to get my academic degrees. However, it is only philosophical works of English, which is simple in words of writing, can be read passable with the help of dictionaries by me, because the grammar of English is the most simple in the existent forms of Latin. At least the changeable forms of nouns, verbs and adjectives of English are

much less than that of Russian and German. I could not make it clear about the declension or conjugation of Russian nouns even at the end of my learning of Russian, because the changeable forms of the typical nouns of Russian language are too many and I could not remember them all. Today I can only remember that a few words or sentences of the oral greetings, such as how are you, good-bye, etc., while I cannot read or write the letters of Russian alphabet at all, because it is already more than thirty years since I read Russian letters last. As for the grammar of German, I can only remember today that the German nouns are divided into three kinds, that is, feminine gender, masculine and neuter. The other parts of German grammar, I was muddleheaded when I was learning German thirty years ago, to say nothing of reading any German book. There is an old Chinese maxim to describe the phenomenon, “only few people can understand the highbrow art and literature”.

English has become the strongest form of Latin at present in the world. One of its expressing forms is that one of the main working language of almost all the international academic meetings is English. One of the reasons why English has become the strongest form of Latin is that the natural and social sciences are developing very fast, and the productivity is developing very fast, in modern times in the counties, which regulate that English is the first official written language, like in the United States of America, Great Britain, Canada, etc. But at the same time, I believe that another reason why English has become the strongest form of Latin is that the grammar of English is the simplest, and the English letters of alphabet is the least among the existent forms of Latin system of languages. English has 26 letters of alphabet. German has 30 letters of alphabet. Russian has 32 letters of alphabet. That is to say, the internal structure and external structure of English is the simplest among the existent forms of Latin system of languages. And English is the easiest to learn and can begin to be read and written in the shortest time. There is another old Chinese maxim to describe the phenomenon, “the popular literature or art can spread fastest and almost everyone can understand it”.

The Chinese characters has a history of more than three thousand of years. The other nationalities, which used the other languages, became the ruling nationalities of the whole China or parts of China for several times in the history of China, like in the Qing Dynasty with the Manchu nationality as the ruling nationality of whole China, and in the Yuan Dynasty with the Mongol nationality as the ruling nationality of whole China. However, some of the nationalities, which became the ruling nationalities of whole China or parts of China, gave up the previous official written languages of their own, and changed to use Chinese characters as their official written language, like the Manchu nationality in the Qing Dynasty. I think, there must be some internal and inevitable reasons in this sort of events. The official grammar, spelling, pronunciation, meaning of the words of the Chinese written language changed many times in Chinese history, some of the changes are even very big and distinct, in order to suit and meet the needs of the development of the Chinese culture. And the official grammar, spelling, pronunciation, meaning of the words of the current Chinese written language need continual changes, and even very big and distinct changes, in the future, in order to meet the needs of the continual development of the Chinese culture. I think that the number of everyday Chinese characters need to be

reduced and merged further very much, the four tones of phonetics should to be reduced and merged further, and current official Chinese language need to resolve the problem that the foreign nouns can be easily remembered by both Chinese spoken people and previous foreign languages spoken people. Otherwise, I am afraid that the Chinese written language could not become the sole dominant, or strongest written language in the whole world in the future.

I think that English spoken people also need to change English grammar a lot. Otherwise, I am afraid that the English written language could not become the sole dominant, or strongest written language in the world in the near future, either, if the English spoken people would like to make English as the sole dominant, or strongest written language in the world in the future, no matter it is far or near.

However, overall, it seems to me that it is easier to revise the English grammar than to reduce the number of Chinese letters because many Chinese letters are both letters and the words at the same time. The subjective dialectics itself is an important part of human culture, and represents the highest level of the thinking of a community. The development of it will help the relevant communities to develop all the other disciplines, such as sciences, engineering, agriculture, medicine, economics, management, law, history, geography, biology, etc. It is because that each person, no matter whatever discipline he belongs to, has to limit or define his sphere of thinking and practice, whenever he carry out his thinking and practice to meet his need, in order to have an effective thinking and practice. To limit or define his sphere of his thinking and practice belongs to the sphere of the subjective dialectics. This is the reason why all the postgraduates, who study for their highest degrees, no matter the disciplines in which he studies, are called Doctor of Philosophy, after they graduate.

At the same time, the development of all the other disciplines are depend the development of the system of words, lexicology, linguistics, etc., especially the linguistic philosophy. This book talks much about linguistic philosophy.

We should try our best to raise the degree of the axiomatization of the subjective dialectics further, such as try our best to resolve the problems of pointing out the contemporary differentia of the concepts of philosophy, science, religion, law and morality, etc., and resolving the problems of pointing out the relationship between them, when we make them antagonistic against each other directly, no matter how difficult they are, in order to keep the human culture to develop faster and to raise the absolute living standard of the mankind in the future.

As a matter of fact, it is only the end of the first stage, or primary stage, in the axiomatization of the subjective dialectics, when one language, it seems either Chinese or English at present, will become the sole dominant written language in the near future. Hundreds of books can not finish the task to compare the existential languages, which have got comparatively large spoken population, such as Chinese, English, Russian, French, German, Arabic, Spanish, Portuguese, Japanese, etc. This book is only a start.

Notes

Note 1. *Immanuel Kant's Critique Of Pure Reason*, trans. by Norman Kemp Smith, London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1929, pp. 338-339, A 357.

Note 2. Compare *Immanuel Kant's Critique Of Pure Reason*, trans. by Norman Kemp Smith, London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1929, p. 488, A 572, B 600.

Note 3. *Immanuel Kant's Critique Of Pure Reason*, trans. by Norman Kemp Smith, London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1929, pp. 338-339, A 357.

Note 4. G. W. F. Hegel, *The Encyclopaedia Logic*, trans. by William Wallace, third edition, New York: Oxford University Press, 1975, p. 203, §143.

Note 5. See also *Hegel's Logic, Being Part One of the Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences* (1830), trans. by William Wallace, third edition, New York: Oxford University Press, 1975, reprinted 1991, p. 228, §163-164.

Note 6. Dong Zhiyong, *Absolute Value and the Concept of Human Rights*, ISBN: 978-981-11-3863-8, Self-publishing, registered in Singapore in August 2017, available for sale in www.amazon.co.uk. For more details can be contacted with Prof. Zhiyong DONG, dongzy@nwu.edu.cn.